

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 16 remain active in this case.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo (US006629136B1) in view of Wilson (US007007080B2); and Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naidoo in view of Wilson, further in view of Coppinger et al. (US20010046862A1).

Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding grounds for rejection because in Applicant's view the cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed invention.

In particular, pending Claim 1 recites:

Claim 1: A portable terminal in an information distribution system using a local server accessible through a local radio network for a short-distance communication and a subscription server accessible through a public network for a long-distance communication, the portable terminal comprising:
a local radio network interface configured to access the local server through the local radio network;
a public network interface configured to access the subscription server through the public network;
a local server access request unit configured to send an access request for original local information provided by the local server, to the local server through the local radio network, along with a terminal ID for identifying the portable terminal; and
a membership subscription request unit configured to receive a server access membership subscription guidance for urging the portable terminal to carry out a membership subscription procedure through the local radio network when the access request is rejected by the local server, and then send a server access membership subscription request through the public network to an address of the subscription server described in the server access membership subscription guidance.

Thus, Applicant's invention is directed to a portable terminal integrated with both of a local radio network interface configured to access the local server through the local radio network and a public network interface configured to access the subscription server through

the public network. It is Applicant's view that the cited references fail to teach or obviate the claimed invention, for the reasons next discussed.

First commenting on the outstanding Office Action, the grounds for rejection appear to be based on the finding that "Naidoo teaches that mobile terminal is configured to request for accessing geographic location based information," and therefore "it is obvious ... that the terminal must be integrated with a local radio network interface and local server access request unit." The outstanding Office Action further asserts that it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the terminal must be integrated with a public network interface because Naidoo discloses that the user is given an option to register over the phone if the local information access is denied.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Naidoo fails to teach or suggest a portable terminal integrated with both of a local radio network interface configured to access the local server through the local radio network and a public network interface configured to access the subscription server through the public network.

On the contrary, Naidoo discloses that a user must register for account either through a telephone, the mail, or online through a PC if the user does not have a registered account (see col. 8, lines 51-59 and col. 11, lines 30-37). Naidoo however fails to teach or suggest that a user node 100 (or a communications device 400) itself carries out the registration for account through the telephone (public network). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted Naidoo fails to teach or suggest the portable terminal integrated with both of the local radio network interface and the public network interface.

Wilson also fails to teach or suggest the portable terminal integrated with both of the local radio network interface and the public network interface.


Accordingly, in view of the noted deficiencies in Naidoo and Wilson, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4, and 16 patentably distinguish over these references whether these references are considered singly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection based on Naidoo and Wilson is therefore believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Coppinger et al. cited in the rejection of Claim 3 also fails to teach or suggest the portable terminal integrated with both of the local radio network interface and the public network interface, as above discussed in relation to Naidoo and Wilson. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of Claims 1-4 and 16 is patentably distinguishing over the cited prior art references, whether considered alone or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection based on Naidoo, Wilson and Coppinger et al. is therefore believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, in view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding grounds for rejection have been traversed. No further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)